Universal Democracy Constitution

A. Fundamental Purpose

Philosophy or Simply The Best

B. Basic Rights / Bill of Rights

Personal Priority Rights

Democratic & Minority Rights

Justice Rights; Definition of Natural Justice

C. General General Provisions

Law Interpretations to be in Line with this Constitution

Laws to be in Line with this Constitution

Constitutional Adjustments

Oath of the 3 Powers

Referenda & early General Elections

Salary of the 3 Powers

Currency Reference

Election- and Voting-Method Requirements

D. Constitution of Powers & Safeguards

Parliament and Government

[Upper House (for federal states only)]

Presidents

Constitution Court

E. Emergencies

Definition & Range

Weekly Review of Emergency Status by Constitution Court

Priority for emergency-delayed General Elections

Declarations of Emergency

A. Fundamental Purpose

Philosophy or Simply The Best

Meaning of Philosophy

*A Greek word meaning "**love of wisdom**" and consequently the thinking about thinking. It is literally universal, and is the all-encompassing term of religion, is it not ? --- Why ?*

Superposing Philosophical Term

*One branch of philosophy is called altruistic hedonism. It means the wellbeing or "happiness" of the greatest number – not only oneself but of all, and maybe not limited to humans alone. Regrettably, it has not yet been realized that altruistic hedonism is the **superposing philosophical term**, and that its principles are increasingly theoretically and publicly accepted throughout this world. — Really? How comes that?*

Superposing Praxis Terms

Quite simple: It's called civilization, and means a well-designed democratic system including constitutional safeguards — This is the practical form of altruistic hedonism!

Amazingly, democracy is also communism (from "community"; the East Block never had democracy and thus communism, but helped the downgrading of this term by vested western interests, nor had the West Block – you can hardly describe a fascistic-corrupt 2-party system in this way).

And it also includes: Electron or gene omnipotence, machismo, capitalism, materialism, egotism, pacifism, artism, rationalism, vegetarianism, meritocracy, *Buddhism, Christianity, Islam, Gnosticism, Atheism, scientologism, technologism, etc. –ism, when it is regulated by the whole community so that it does not clash in serious ways with all the other pluralistic minority –isms --- and vice versa!*

Incompatibilities

However, some –isms are fundamentally incompatible with democracy's altruistic hedonism, i.e. cannibalism, dictatorship, monarchy, satanism, fascism, anarchy, hereditary aristocracy, *etc.*

Hence there is the outcrying need for a fundamental agreement between all persons, like for a Constitution, Basic Law or Bill of Rights!

But is it really the best?

Reason for Universal Implementation

The answer is given by the question itself! It is the best, because all want the best for one's own wellbeing, and this philosophy is continuously trying to optimize and achieve just this. Practically, it means the best all-including compromise between the ruling ruled in a democratic system —

At its best when safeguarded with the best open-approach constitution.

Underlying Principle

But what is best? Today's best could well turn out as tomorrow's worst! History and science show this aspect of "human nature" and "knowledge" clearly; Besides that, one needs to make mistakes to learn to correct them … and to learn.

If one could only prevent the worst damaging mistakes!

Religions are in general absolute: capitalists are always right and must therefore govern the world, and most other religions usually likewise. But again and again there appear wholly convinced believers who suddenly change to another religion, because they found themselves caught in a maddening contradictory situation.

Any system that entirely subdues and punishes minority philosophies would rob its rulers of ideas (and freedoms) that could well turn out to be the best tomorrow! With this background one can paradoxically never say what the best sub-philosophy is, but one can say that the best superposing philosophy or societal system is the one that keeps all options open -- with some regulations against excessiveness, before all have to bear the damaging results ***:***
Societal and ecological disaster through unlimited all- and self-destroying corrupting and wealth-accumulating egotism (materialism / capitalism) that would not even want its own destruction!

Motto

Just call it ***The Best For The Most***

Not very long after Jesus, Marcus Aurelius (A.D. 121-180) placed as a Roman emperor the wellbeing of society before his own individual comfort (while enjoying the spoils of an emperor, of course…):

"What is not good for the swarm, is not good for the bee"

Remarks *(or are they conclusions?)*

Absolute philosophies try to cement their arrogant rule above all others for eternity, which is a form of stagnation. By definition, stagnation ultimately means the end of physical and mental life… No more questions please! You need no old age or university degree to be wise, but a mental struggle would help: Why are the ignorant so sure, and the wise so unsure?

And for us galaxy hitchhikers the answer to the question of absolute sense or purpose of it all remains 42 for the time being; Did the computer create this figure, or did the laboratory mice? ⇧

B. Basic Rights / Bill of Rights

Personal Priority Rights

Article 1 The inherent dignity of a person shall be respected (incl. freedom from slavery)

Article 2 Right not to be injured or deprived of life

Article 3 Right not to be subjected to torture or cruel treatment

Article 4 Right not to be subjected to medical or scientific experimentation

Article 5 Right to refuse to be subjected to medical treatment

Democratic & Minority Rights

Article 1.1 Right to democratic self-determination (including cultural practises),

Right to vote in regular General Elections & Referenda, for permanent residents

Article 1.2 Right to freedom of expression (including reception of expressions)

Article 1.3 Right to freedom of philosophy, thought & conscience (including religion)

Article 1.4 Right to freedom of peaceful assembly, movement and residence, for residents

Article 1.5 Right to freedom from negative discrimination

Article 1.6 Right to uncover unconstitutional practises (whistle-blowing)

Article 1.7 Right to freedom from unjustified (incl. arbitrary) search and/or seizure of person, property and/or private information (incl. correspondence, electronic data, surveillance)

Justice Rights

Article 2.1 Right to natural justice; **Definition of Natural Justice:**

Natural: ***Following the logical causal chain, arranging real causes/events and their real results/ consequences in the time-correct sequence; It does not mean first-past-the-post, virtual or mad!***

Justice: ***Balance of the adherence to reasonable agreements, including democratically originated laws, under the safeguarding frame of this Constitution; It includes correction of breaches with compensation of victims as one part, with the aim to prevent repetitions of breaches***

Article 2.2 Right not to be repeatedly punished for the same crime/offence; Correction/punishment only when a law described such crime/offence at the time of commitment

Article 2.3 Right to public judicial hearings (including records) by default

Article 2.4 Right to appeal/judicial review ⇧

Article 2.5 Minimum criminal-procedure rights for accused persons:

(i) Prompt information of nature and cause of charge

(ii) Support by and instruction of a trusted legal expert as priority over ability to pay

(iii) Adequate time, facilities and secrecy to prepare a defence

(iv) Choice of trial by jury when penalty includes detention of nominally more than 3 months

Article 2.6 Rights of detained persons:

(i) Prompt information of reason for arrest (incl. charge) and right to legal-expert support

(ii) Judicial determination within 2 days of continued detention (automatic Habeas Corpus); the judge has to ensure compliance with article 2.5,and order detention or release

(iii) The related embassy and a person trusted by the detainee must be promptly informed of any continuing detention

(iv) Articles 1 to 5 explicitly apply

C. General Provisions

Article 3.1 Interpretations of laws in line with this Constitution shall be preferred

Article 3.2 Laws and other limitations of constitutional rights only if these can be demonstrably justified in a free and democratic society

Article 3.3 Constitutional Adjustments

The aim for applying or adjusting this Constitution must be the achievement of the maximum/optimum functional degree of informed & safeguarded democracy & philosophy for the peaceful human society and justice in the world, without severely limiting constitutional rights

Constitutional adjustments only by 2/3 majority of Parliament plus 2/3 majority of Presidents plus ¾ of Constitution-Court Judges, or 2/3 majority of totality of voters via a Constitutional Referendum

Article 3.4 Oath of the Powers

Presidents, Constitution-Court Judges and Parliament's Ministers should be at least 40 years of age, must not be under oath of allegiance to any person (incl. fascistic brother/sisterhood organization), and must deliver the following oath to the General Public before Parliament:

"I swear on oath that I will apply my efforts for the General Public's well being, for the prevention of injury and damage, for the protection, defence & upholding of this Constitution, and for the enacting of natural justice towards everyone."

Article 3.5 Early General Elections and Referenda can be induced by absolute majority of 2 constitutional powers; In case of an election-method failure can the Constitution Court order full or partial new elections (without enabling bias) as soon as possible

Referenda are binding the powers, if they achieved absolute majority plus absolute majority of Presidents plus 2/3 majority of Constitution-Court Judges (except Constitutional adjustments), or if they achieved 2/3 majority of totality of voters (similar to a Constitutional Referendum)

Article 3.6 Any constitutional power's salary increase only by agreement of absolute majority of the other 2 constitutional powers, which can also determine a salary reduction of max.20% but not less than a total of 80% to their own salary within one election period; reductions can be self-imposed with absolute majority

Article 3.7 Reference for the monetary currency value is the basic financial / universal income that provides for any resident's basic needs

A National / Central Bank created by law safeguards the value of the country's currency, in order to involve the constitutional safeguard powers

A currency loan or equivalent can only be created via an explicit specific law, in order to involve the constitutional safeguard powers

Article 3.8 Election- and Voting-Method Requirements

Voting right limitations: A voter must be at least 18 years of age with the centre of life in the voting area without voting in other similar areas' elections, must not be under mental guardianship, and not be under nominal detention for nominal duration of at least 3 years;

All votes are ultimately non-forcible conscience votes;

Maximum proportionality of philosophies, especially with Parliament (one party vote per voter);

Political parties are general-access parties; members should avoid acting against declared aims;

No multiple political-party membership; private financing needs to be limited by law;

Election of individual persons' maximum competence & quality (minimal corruption);

Secret-Ballot but open-vote-counting elections of all 3 constitutional powers, persons and referenda;

Absolute majority shall be minimum standard for elections and decisions;

Maximization of majority shall be constitutional preference for minimal limitations of rights;

Parliament's, President's and Constitution-Court's decision voting shall be open to public scrutiny; Presidents and Constitution Court can enforce publication (must explicitly include dissenting decisions!) in all main media entities (privately and/or publicly owned);
A valid new election replaces the previous elected entity; These requirements need to be balanced and safeguarded into a workable method.

D. Constitution of Powers & Safeguards

Parliament and Government (law-discussion and -decision forum & power)

Article 4.1 Parliament is the primary democratic institution for the normal day-to-day running of the country's affairs that are:

(i) Creation of binding democratic agreements called laws

(ii) Parliament can overrule previous constitutional case-law via explicitly worded laws, unless any of the 2 other powers overrule this

(iii) Absolute-majority secret-ballot election of the speaker; The speaker organizes and regulates Parliament's discussions and decision-makings in a party-proportional neutral way, and ensures access of the public's media in an unbiased and safe way

(iv) Determining the government (at least absolute majority of all 100 parliamentarians)

(v) Election of Ministers via absolute-majority secret ballots

(vi) Administration of laws and government praxis

(vii) Appointment of first-instance-court judges and leading government officials via Appointment Panel; one seat per party with more than 5 parliamentarians (absolute-majority elected), smaller parties' parliamentarians combine to elect one likewise

Article 4.2 Default minimum standard of election method:

Country is divided into 100 equally populated electorates, which elect one political-party candidate using absolute-majority single-transferable vote (STV); Every voter elects one philosophy/party vote

A minimum of 500 members, increasing to 1000 at population of ca. 5 million and 2000 at ca. 20 million, form a general-access (not exclusive fascistic club) political party, and elect their candidates via STV absolute majority onto a party list, top-rank first with their resulting increasing elimination from the voting process; In a similar way the party distributes these candidates over the 100 electorates

If a party gains less or more direct winner-candidates than its proportional countrywide party-vote limit, the highest-ranking candidates on the party-list will enter Parliament to that limit

[**Upper House** (for federal states only)] (safeguard power)

Article 5.1 The federal states' parliaments determine their representatives, population-adjusted

Article 5.2 Upper House can veto laws with absolute majority, if these contravene sub-states' constitutions or exceed their financial or resource capabilities

Article 5.3 Sub-states enact federal law as agents of the federal state ⇧

Presidents (safeguard power)

Article 6.1 Laws can be vetoed on justified constitutional grounds, or the Constitution Court be involved to determine related constitutional law matters

Article 6.2 Parliament's speaker can be vetoed on justified incompetence reasons (incl. corruption, dishonesty, criminal history, unsuitable conduct), or replaced if Parliament is unable to function

Article 6.3 Ministers can be vetoed or denoted on justified incompetence reasons

Article 6.4 Appellate-Court judges are appointed, or removed on justified incompetence reasons

Article 6.5 Lower judicial investigators/judges can be removed on justified incompetence reasons

Article 6.6 Presidents are the joint chief commanders of military during declared emergencies

Article 6.7 Default minimum standard of election method:

A minimum of 3 Presidents, increasing to 5 at population of ca. 20 million and 7 at ca. 50 million

The presidents with the most dis-election votes lose their positions, until 1/3 of presidents are left; Candidates of all presidential lists with the most votes become presidents until positions are filled

A political party elects its candidates via absolute-majority single-transferable vote onto a candidate list, top-rank first with their resulting increasing elimination from the voting process; This list is limited to the number of presidential vacancies (not more than 2/3 of seats)

If a vacancy arises between elections, the remaining candidate highest-polling on the presidential election-result list fills it

Constitution Court (highest legal-intellectual reasoning forum & safeguard power)

Article 7.1 Function is the examination and determination of the constitutionality of laws and actions (incl. those of the 3 Powers) with maximum general consistency according to natural justice

Article 7.2 Fast-track provisions to prevent severe injustice, to prevent undermining of this Constitution, and to cope with individual or collective emergencies

Article 7.3 Invalidation or modification only of those law parts that contravene this Constitution

Article 7.4 If a lower court finds an unsolvable uncertainty of jurisdiction or inconsistency with this Constitution or international Human-Rights agreements by another law, it shall pause judicial proceedings and direct this law matter to the Constitution Court for determination.

Article 7.5 If a lower court intents to deviate from current constitutional case law, it shall pause judicial proceedings and direct this law matter to the Constitution Court for determination.

Article 7.6 [If a federal-state court intents to deviate from current interpretations of this Constitution by a fellow state's constitution court, it shall pause judicial proceedings and direct this law matter to the Constitution Court for determination. (for federal states only)] ⇧

Article 7.7 Default minimum standard of election method is similar to election of presidents:

A minimum of 7 judges, increasing to 9 at population of ca. 7 million and 12 at ca. 20 million

The judges with the most dis-election votes lose their positions, until 1/3 of judges are left; Candidates of all judicial lists with the most votes become judges until positions are filled

A political party elects its candidates via absolute-majority single-transferable vote onto a candidate list, top-rank first with their resulting increasing elimination from the voting process; This list is limited to the number of judicial vacancies (not more than 2/3 of seats)

If a vacancy arises between elections, the remaining candidate highest-polling on the judicial election-result list fills it

E. Emergencies

Article 8.1 Definition of Emergency:

A sudden change of conditions severely threatening or causing damage (incl. constitutional damage) to the wider public, and requiring fast relief response to prevent or reduce such damage.

Such a change foreseeable for more than one week should not lead to a declared emergency, nor should such continuous conditions justify repeated or permanent declared emergencies. A declared emergency allows immediate but minimized limitations of constitutional rights beyond law provisions, bypassing but not removing time-consuming parliamentary or judicial processes.

Article 8.2 Any declaration of emergency must be weekly agreed to by the appropriate majority of the Constitution Court to remain valid with the presidents as joint chief commanders of the military

Article 8.3 If a declared emergency status prevented regular General Elections, then these must be held within 3 months after the emergency as of priority

Declarations of Emergency

Article 8.4 A declaration of emergency for max. 1 week by all presidents, or prime minister plus absolute majority of presidents

Article 8.5 A declaration of emergency for max. 3 months by all ministers plus absolute majority of presidents, or absolute majority of presidents plus 2/3 of Constitution-Court judges

Article 8.6 A declaration of emergency for max. 1 year by absolute majority of parliament plus 2/3 majority of presidents plus 2/3 of Constitution-Court judges

Article 8.7 A declaration of military combat emergency by absolute majority of parliament plus 2/3 majority of presidents plus ¾ majority of Constitution-Court judges

(This design is derived from German Basic Law, NZ/Canadian Bill of Rights, and Swiss Constitution)

Remarks:

This Universal Democracy Constitution's 3-tier safeguard principles (checks & balances) are meant to prevent a creeping undermining by fascism (organized brotherhood gangs), and can also be used for smaller forms of societal organization, e.g. for a country's natives/tribes and other minorities, or for stakeholder decisions of extended families, clubs, business corporations -- you name it…

Such a wide-ranging constitution is best introduced gradually but logically over some adjustment-and experience period, before it is enshrined via a binding referendum to achieve a supermajority! The publicly elected Constitution Court is best installed at an early stage to safeguard against constitutional uncertainties and trials to remove basic democracy provisions, e.g. via populistically deceiving the public into referenda like that in Britain that prevented proportional parliamentary representation (a democracy minimum).

A constitutional democracy can hardly work in super-states the size of continents, partly because of the huge campaigning costs for minor parties and their political candidates, or because of the dependence on mass media incl. internet that could be censored/controlled by competing interests; Such super-states need to be divided into national areas of approx. 100 million inhabitants that can combine to a less dictating superstructure without relinquishing their national constitutional powers (see European Union)! However, inert existing real structures may require optimising compromises.

The list of .pdf files in "New Zealand Local-Democracy Supreme-Court Documents" https://www.scribd.com/document/341435238/New-Zealand-Local-Democracy-Supreme-Court-Documents contain details about the maximum public-interest New Zealand Supreme-Court case that should have overturned the fascism-supporting anti-democratic part of NZ's Local Electoral Act (law), but proved instead the very purpose and need for this Universal Democracy Constitution in every detail, uncovering all (il)legal tricks that the monarchy uses to actively prevent democracy, human rights and legal natural justice in its own courts that sit at the position of a constitution court, but refuse to enact rights-providing laws!

It serves as proof as well as a guideline for defusing the traps that would invalidate such a democracy constitution in hidden court practice.

This Universal Democracy Constitution was designed by Fritz Fehling in June 2013, "finalized" in July, and then sent to the NZ government's Constitutional Review Panel in 2013, which was set up to achieve an eternal fortification of the British/New Zealand monarchy via 2/3 or ¾ majority requirement for constitutional change; However, its native Maori members achieved as a result the remark that further discussions etc. were needed, because Maori experienced breaches of the founding constitutional New Zealand Treaty of Waitangi with the crown/monarchy since 1840… Later the monarchy censored this Universal Democracy Constitution by omitting it from the panel's "submission" report to prevent availability over the internet…

Basis Considerations to

Democracy Constitution, Constitutional Democracy

Contents

1. **Definition of Constitutional Democracy/Republic**
   - 1.1. No Practical Democracy/Republic Definition
   - 1.2. Developing Grades of Democracy
   - 1.3. Basic Principle of Democracy
   - 1.4. Aim of Constitutional Democracy
   - 1.5. Optimum Principle of Democracy
   - 1.6. Political Spectrum of Democracy

2. **Constitutional Democracy Safeguards**
   - 2.1. Human-, Minority- and Justice Rights
   - 2.2. Relative-, Absolute-, Supermajority
   - 2.3. Secret-Ballot Elections
   - 2.4. Minimum Election Threshold
   - 2.5. Separation of Powers
   - 2.6. **Example** (Reference) **:** **Universal Democracy Constitution**.pdf

3. **Roughly-Summarised History**
   - 3.1. Democratic Human Right
   - 3.2. Ancient Democracy Origins
   - 3.3. Parliamentary Monarchies
   - 3.4. Parliamentary Theocracies
   - 3.5. One-Party Oligarchies
   - 3.6. Constitutional Democracies

4. **Open-Source Democracy Constitution**

Definition of Constitutional Democracy/Republic

A Democracy-/Republic Constitution is the connection of the meaning of both single-word meanings; Constitution(al) is the reliable definition of an organisation's [power] structure, and is today purposed as a working safeguard for democracies/republics (unwritten constitutions like the British monarchy cannot readily be retrieved and are not reliable but dependent on arbitrary interpretational power). "**Re-public**" is the Roman/Latin word for "**democracy**" (Greek, "people's power/rule"), and means returning the rule/power "back again to the common public" (publicus, plebeius – common, public; or res publica -- common public thing/affair, incl. power) in form of a state; Today it is commonly used for representative parliamentary democracy. The use of these words is imprecise: By age-old practice it was often used as pretence to hide and justify dictatorships by a few rich, which are correctly called plutocracy, oligarchy, aristocracy, monarchy, theocracy, fascism, etc. instead, because "common public" is not limited to a few rich dictators. [Such fudging-propaganda deviation of the meaning of democracy/republic does not justify its acceptance and re-definition, unless the purpose-definition of "language" were changed from enabling truthful communication to cheating pretence. See draft talk: "constitutional democracy".

No Practical Democracy-/Republic Definition

A nationwide 100% consensus cannot generally be achieved; Furthermore, an entirely direct democracy via direct election by all participants is insufficiently practicable (too many changing decision topics, too much time requirement for full information of individuals who are also legal lays, too big influence by manipulators, too little election safety, incl. sufficient participation and safety against vote-/data-rigging, too-low majorities, too primitive populistic pre-determining referenda questions, etc.), while its substitute, the democracy via elected representatives or parliamentarians (commonly called republic), is not always reflecting at least the average will of the population, and without checks & balances tends to result in misuse of power and ultimately in dictatorship.

Literal democracy/republic is also an impracticable utopia, because rule by the people's every individual implies the "rest" to be ruled over and to obey, proving it to be a self-contradicting term (oxymoron)! This explains the considerable amount of derivates/interpretations, some even fudging democracy with fundamentally incompatible monarchies, dictatorships, one-party oligarchies etc. A practical definition and thus reference (for comparison measurements) can only be a contradiction-solving definition substitute in form of an idealised all-safeguards-including constitution blueprint like the **Universal Democracy Constitution**.

Developing Grades of Democracy

Many measurements of nations' degree of achieved democracy are lacking an objective "measure-stick" reference and are blind-flying propaganda-like approximations of apples versus oranges. This is exacerbated by nations' differing cultural/social historical background and thus wisdom of the peoples, out of which differing grades of [constitutional] democracy/republic are developing. In addition, it is common for undemocratic systems to call themselves "democracy/republic", and to design their constitutions and legal systems in a complicated manner, so that the population can neither recognise nor limit or remove the true dictatorship/oligarchy; Politics is also the manipulation of the population by politicians…

Therefore until 2020 no system had sufficiently approached the elusive optimum of constitutionally safeguarded democracy/republic.

Basic Principle of Democracy

The basis of modern democracy/republic is founded on the basic principle of equal rights of every individual (with few exceptions) regarding their power exertion via topic- and person-elections – One human, one people-government share/vote.

Aim of Constitutional Democracy

The neutral aim of Constitutional Democracy/Republic is the permanent maximisation of wisdom incl. problem solving, with minimisation of violence (Constitutional democracies must not have the death penalty, because this would violate the main human right).

Optimum Principle of Democracy

A stable and on average medium-/long-term accurate maximum of democracy could be achieved, if the practice of optimum-compromise finding, which is the very basis of practical democracy, were also applied to the democratic system itself: The result is a safeguarding optimised Democracy/Republic Constitution as the substitute for the elusive practical definition of democracy/republic!

Political Spectrum of Democracy

Democracy's political spectrum ideally includes every philosophy except those extremes that are fundamentally incompatible with democracy :

Altruism/Environmentalism

— **Altruistic Hedonism** ''(practised democracy)'' —

Hedonism/Egocentrism

"Left" **:**		***"Right"*** **:**
Social Democrats, Labour Parties,	—	Conservatives, Liberals,
Environmentalism,	—	Ego-centrism, unrestricted Capitalism,
Protesters / Demonstrators / Anarchists,	—	Command & Obey Hierarchy,
Equality / Egalitarianism,	—	Aristocracy, Class System,
Socialism, Trade Unions,	—	Fascism (club/brotherhood/gang dictate)*),
One-(worker)party Marxist Communism,	—	Oligarchy (rule by an established few rich),
Dictatorship by one or an established few (Leninist 'Communism'),	==	Dictatorship by one (including monarch).

*) In reality, this hidden fascism (see German Wikipedia) also strongly exists politically left. Above simplistic either-or dualistic-adversarial *Left*-versus-*Right* practise known from the British First-Past-the-Post relative-majority parliament is older than the English parliament and contains deliberate and extreme but subtle propaganda-like bias: It not only implies that the left is always weaker and less capable than the right (hand), but also that the political right is always inherently (even hereditarily) right(-eous). Such bias was already practised in Roman Times where the word 'sinister' (devious, malicious, evil) meant 'left' but also 'unlucky' or 'fraudulent'.
A democracy constitution is designed to guard against democracy-destroying left-or-right extremes.

Constitutional Democracy Safeguards

A Democracy Constitution must contain safety precautions which permanently protect it against any power assumption by dictators of any kind. Else it would be prevented and invalidated rather fast (even by force) after being passed into law: In 2017 the Turkish president obtained dictator powers via a simple-majority referendum and purged his critics from official positions; in 2018 China's president was enabled by the one-party National-People's-Congress delegates to rule for life; whereas in 2011 the British population was deceived into a simple-majority referendum against the democracy minimum of proportional representation. This tendency derives from countless historic experiences of the instability of free independent (horizontal- or equal-organised) individuals, in contrast to apparently strong (but also unstable) hierarchic (vertical command-and-obey) association of followers with one or few violence-exerting or –threatening dictators, incl. hereditary dictators (monarchs) and oligarchs (oligarchy: rule by a few). Such vertical-organised associations achieve in connection with live-threatening power an extreme strong coherence (fascism via brotherhoods, gangs with mainstreaming of their members' philosophy), thus preventing democracy at least internally if not nationwide or worldwide. This is then challenged by a likewise violence-exerting or –threatening revolution, e.g. in form of uncontrollable mass demonstrations/civil disobedience, boycotts, assassinations, or by dictatorship/military coup, or by military invasion as occurred in World War II, etc. in a vicious circle.

Human-, Minority- and Justice Rights

A Democracy Constitution must contain human-, minority- and justice rights, which cannot be readily removed via simple-majority laws, because silenced, starved, murdered (also by removal of the fundamental human right to refuse medical treatment/experiment, incl. indirect euthanasia through dangerous ''mandatory-compulsory'' medication), or without-public-court-hearing imprisoned humans cannot vote or be elected! Major rights (many constitutions contain further rights, but which are not essential for safeguarding democracy):

Right to life and not to be injured/, Right to refuse medical interference, Right to dignity, Freedom of religion, Freedom from discrimination, Right to vote, Freedom of expression, Freedom of assembly/Freedom of association, Freedom of movement, Right to privacy, Right to a fair trial.

As these fundamental rights can often not be reliably enforced, a precise definition of Natural Justice needs also to be included in order to restrict arbitrary hidden overruling and invalidating of the constitution and parliament's laws by the judiciary (the English legal term "natural justice" has never been defined; the precondition is used as pseudo definition instead, because monarchies traditionally prevent any restriction of the monarch's hidden power):
Britain has no constitution court, as it has no written constitution, and laws passed by Parliament can traditionally not be questioned by the courts (royal and later parliamentary sovereignty). Therefore on-the-face-of-it unconstitutional laws cannot be invalidated by the Supreme-Court lord judges succeeding the Privy Council law lords; But the British aristocratic Privy-Council law lords made the British Human Rights Act 1998 (with quasi-constitutional character) and thus *Human Rights* formally unworkable (**[2023] NZHC 3183**): They disabled "formality" human-rights court cases, esp. the necessary provision of governments' *detailed reasons* for overruling fundamental human *rights* that could enable court cases against invalidation of human rights -- Because they *explicitly* wanted to prevent such human-rights court cases.

Relative-, Absolute-, Supermajority

As there will always be a number of dissenting votes among many equal-rights voters, it is impossible to achieve 100% consensus; Thus a Democracy Constitution must regulate decision-making with lesser majorities in order to achieve in the long term a maximum of agreement, without that the ruling absolute majority removes democracy and changes it irreversibly into a dictatorship. For these reasons the absolute >50% parliamentary majority is a minimum requirement, while for constitution alterations and declarations of state of emergency (during which some rights and guarantees are suspended) there must be entrenchment clauses requiring a higher majority (eg. ⅗, ⅔ or ¾, also called supermajority) for the protection of the constitution against a simple majority misled by a populist leader/demagogue. Some constitutions also provide that their most basic principles (like democratic character) can never be abolished, even by amendment.

The English definition (see English-Wikipedia) of simple majority is imprecise and can include the First-Past-The-Post- and plurality-voting, whereas German-Wikipedia differs considerably, defining relative majority similar to First-Past-The-Post- and plurality-voting as <50% (it thus often produces minority governments while disabling/reducing minor parties), absolute or simple majority as >50% of votes (with differences in abstentions), and qualified majority similar to supermajority; This imprecise English definition clearly results from the ingrained traditional FPP-voting practice. ⇧

A constitutional definition of the required degree of majority is necessary, because this relative FPP majority, where one candidate gets more votes than every single other candidate and invalidates as the sole winner all the other votes and philosophies, leads to a non-proportional political spectrum drastically reduced to 2 “left”-versus-“right” parties and hidden fascism, because vertically organised brotherhoods/gangs have the strongest coherence with strong philosophy mainstreaming. The STV single-transferable-vote system is similarly non-proportional, but at least ensures a close to >50%-simple majority for the winning candidate. Proportional STV party voting has until now not been used to enable substitution of invalid below-minimum-threshold-party votes with valid-party votes, because it makes nationwide vote counting very complicated.

Secret-Ballot Elections

While one-person one-vote must be ensured, the casting of the votes must not enable identification, also not with hidden cameras; total surveillance is an extreme threat to democracy with its freedom of speech/demonstrations as its basis of decision making (One–party rule was enforced in Russian-controlled East Germany’s officially secret-ballot elections, because voters had to fear repressions if they cast their votes covered). Elections must also provide counting safeguards: In 2009 the German constitution court ruled electronic voting is unconstitutional, because it cannot be made tamper proof. Its constitutional interpretation of "open public elections" requires that vote counting must be able to be checked without special knowledge

Minimum Election Threshold

Due to the German Weimar-Republik experience with the splintering of parliament into many small parties that were inexperienced in developing compromises and having been finally overpowered by the dictator Hitler, post-war Germany embedded a minimum 5% hurdle for parliamentary parties into the constitution. In today’s constitutionally safeguarded democracy this 5% hurdle tends to favour the 2 main parties (in 2017 approx. 7 million German voters were prevented from representation in parliament); Israel has a 3.25% hurdle, while Italy’s complex hurdles favoured pre-election coalition building for minor parties. -- A parliament of 100 members inherently has a 1% threshold. Several methods are used to determine the proportional allocation of parliamentary seats according to the votes: the Webster/Sainte-Laguë method is increasingly used, while the D’Hondt method favours larger parties.

Separation of Powers

Conventional Separation of Powers: Inconsistent traditional separation was limited to hierarchical state/king versus hierarchical church/religious leader. Constitutions usually explicitly divide power between various branches of government. The standard model of separation of powers, described by the Baron de Montesquieu, involves three branches of government: executive (government), legislative (parliament) and judicial (law courts). Constitutions vary extensively as to the degree of separation of powers between these branches, which are in practice often insufficiently independent from each other:

- In monarchy-like presidential and semi-presidential systems, the president appoints department secretaries/ministers without readily available parliamentary checks. In the case of the United Kingdom and other countries with a monarchy, it is the monarch who appoints and dismisses ministers on the advice of the prime minister. ⇧

In turn the prime minister will resign if the government loses the confidence of a majority of parliament. In many countries the highest-court judges and even presidents (Governor-General in New Zealand, Australia and Canada) are appointed by the government/executive (in New Zealand even only by the Prime Minister/Solicitor-General – in America by the executive president).

These such-determined inherently government-friendly higher judges/presidents often have insufficient drive to clean-up corruption and force the executive government/president to follow the constitution and other laws; If incompetence (incl. corruption) is usually only after publicity superficially corrected, then corrupt officials can be blackmailed if they threaten the status quo by uncovering misuse of power. Thus the danger of power misuse is very high, if executive decision power is concentrated in one single person, e.g. where the president can rule by decree like a monarch, pardon criminals or detain and prosecute political opponents: American presidents can rule monarch-like by issuing decrees, the American/French executive presidents and the British prime minister (thus indirectly the monarch) could bypass parliamentary checks when sending cruise missiles into Syrian chemical plants on suspicions of warfare-chemicals production in 2018, while the Russian, Chinese and Turkish presidents removed political opponents by prosecutions/purging.

- In parliamentary systems, Cabinet Ministers are accountable to parliament, but it is often the prime minister who appoints and dismisses them, if parliament is not conscious enough of its own power because of eg. conventions. Majority (confidence) can be lost if the government loses a vote of no confidence or, depending on the country, loses a particularly important vote in parliament, such as vote on the budget. When a government loses confidence, it stays in office until a new government is formed; something which normally but not necessarily requires the holding of a general election.
- Constitutions are often, but by no means always, protected by a legal body whose job it is to interpret those constitutions. A constitutional violation is an action or legislative act that is judged to be contrary to the constitution and thus void. An example of constitutional violation by the executive could be a public office holder who acts outside the powers granted to that office by a constitution. An example of constitutional violation by the legislature is an attempt to pass a law that would contradict the constitution, without first going through the proper constitutional amendment process.

  In some countries, such as Germany, this function is carried out by a dedicated constitution court which performs this (and only this) function. In other countries, such as Ireland, the ordinary courts may perform this function in addition to their other responsibilities. While elsewhere, like in the United Kingdom, the concept of declaring an act to be unconstitutional does not exist. In Germany appointments of constitution-court judges are more independent via a combined commission of parliament (Bundestag) and federal upper house (Bundesrat).
- Some countries have additionally set out a central bank, an anti-corruption commission, an electoral commission, a police oversight body, a judicial oversight body, a human rights commission, a media commission, an ombudsman, and a truth and reconciliation commission, as so-called independent institutions/checks, but which in practice are appointed often even only by government cabinet or prime minister instead of the whole parliament, and are therefore usually inherently biased.

Optimised Separation of Powers: The solution is a truly independent 3- tier separation of powers in order to prevent hidden fascistic power assumption, where the population directly elects/empowers all constitutional powers. Power should be distributed onto several persons, who ideally also reflect the distribution of philosophies in the population proportionally. These are the neutral requirements of the election methods for parliament, presidents and constitution-court judges, and are the principles of the Universal-Democracy-Constitution example, which also defines the respective election methods!

Example (Reference) **:** **Universal Democracy Constitution**.pdf

Roughly-Summarised History

(Additional References for Above Topics)

Democratic Human Right

After the 2 world wars the League of Nations, then called United Nations (UN) majorly consisting of undemocratic states' governments (without their democratic oppositions), and with undemocratic veto rights limited to the war victors, created fundamental human rights, including the right to self-determination, which is democracy for a human society. These should prevent further wars as well as their dictatorship origins, because wars generally produce extreme suffering and damage.

Similarly, the European-Union constitution cannot overrule member states' constitutions. Its approximately-proportionally elected parliament (with a 3% minor-party threshold) is slowly increasing in power, now being on a similar level with the Council of Ministers, which together with the Commission represent the state governments (without their democratic oppositions similar to UN). It has adopted above human rights, and its EU Court of Human Rights can make very public judgments, but its registrars are indirectly determined by the state governments.

Ancient Democracy Origins

* The **Roman republic** replaced a monarchy, and developed a complex structure of Tribunes, Magistrates, Assemblies and Senate apparently with mutual checks & balances, partly enshrined in writing, and partly derived from the Greek system. According to Wikipedia's Constitution of the Roman Republic there existed the familiar constant power struggle between the rich and the common-public poor, whereby the rich had increasingly curtailed the common-public's republic/democratic power most of the time so far as to make the word "republic" inappropriate (German-Wikipedia describes it as an aristocracy with some elements of democracy, and excludes the Roman empire from 27bC on).

* The early **Greek democracy** was similarly limited: Although it reduced the power of aristocratic families who literally enslaved farmers, it was also limited to male citizens, and used even a lottery as substitute for voting out of the first 2 wealth classes. Democratic rights were then further improved, leading even to the right to speak in the assemblies, but which resulted in the ⇧

dominance of skilled speakers. These demagogues even manipulated assemblies into unjust executions, which was later made punishable. The targeted prevention of oligarchy appears to have been relatively successful until the invasion of the Macedonians.

* **New Zealand's Maori tribes** had a 100%-consensus method limited to men and dominated by hereditary aristocrats, while the **North American Iroquois** had a multi-tribal assembly of men elected by the women.

Parliamentary Monarchies

* **Britain** still hadn't achieved a written reliable democracy constitution in 2018, and relies on precedence, judge-made case "law" and tradition instead (parliamentary monarchies do not have independently enforceable constitutions/independent constitution courts, because a classical absolute unelected monarch **is** the constitution). Human rights were written into common-level laws instead. The medieval Magna Carta can be regarded as the first trial of a written human-rights constitution between the king and his aristocrats, but its interpretation/enforcement still depended on the monarch's highest court, the Privy Council with its law lords. The unelected British (Canadian/Australian/New Zealand) monarch still has totalitarian power per law (hidden in e.g. New Zealand's Constitution Act 1986), under which all parliamentary bills need royal assent/signature to become law (and can be rejected/ignored), and all parliamentarians, high officials, soldiers, judges, and indirectly also **all** barrister-lawyers incl. crown prosecutors, are under oath of allegiance to their monarch – policemen are under the additional oath to keep the peace of the monarch (not of the democratic people).This human-rights-forsaking oath requirement makes it impossible for consistent democrats to be elected/appointed, and prevents referenda and laws aiming to change the monarchy into a constitutional democracy. In Northern Ireland it also prevented the Ireland re-unification party from claiming British parliamentary seat(s) that remain unoccupied!

The British monarchs also reserved theocracy-like power, because they are the head of the Anglican Church (King Henry VIII confiscated the Catholic Church, because it refused to allow his divorce), and there existed a forgotten blasphemy law in New Zealand still in 2017.

* (Wild-West) **America** as former English colony had developed a relative-majority indirect-voting system, where an indirectly-elected (via middlemen in the "Electoral College") king-like executive president (who can issue decrees and pardon convicted criminals, thus having total immunity like a monarch) for maximal 8 years; he appoints ministers called secretaries, and Supreme-Court judges. This was partly copied from the royal-British Westminster First-Past-The-Post system, treating the federal states as electorates, while replacing the English parliament (House of Commons) and aristocratic (upper) House of Lords with the House of Representatives and Senate, with some Roman-derived checks & balances as well as Magna-Carta-like human-rights aspects and a right to carry guns (This FPP system enabled in 2000 and 2016 compromise-less minority governments/presidents in America, even though the opposition candidate achieved more votes).

* **India** had a long and complex revolutionary history as a colony of the British monarchy, which ended in 1947 after Mahatma Gandhi's non-violent civil-disobedience revolution resulted in a constitutional presidential state system in 1950 with the world's longest constitution. The very powerful American-like executive president is indirectly elected by an American-like electoral college of members of both houses of parliament, the State Legislative Assembly and of several ⇧

other Union Territories, but with single transferable vote. The Supreme Court apparently acts as a check & balance, but its chief judge, who advises appointment of other judges, is appointed by the president. The constitution defines some human rights and also duties (some are non-justifiable/-enforceable) like [military] defence of the country, abjuration of violence and protection of the environment, but does not define the democratic election method of parliament and party-candidates except for equal voter participation that overwrites any class system.

* The constitution of **Japan** is a result of the post-war victors' influence that enshrined detailed [human] rights, disabled the military (which is in practice circumvented for self-defence), and reduced the monarch's power apparently only to "ceremonial", but still retaining similar functions (and thus nearly absolute powers) as the British monarch. The National Diet parliament is only partially proportional, one half is determined by the relative-majority FPP method favouring the 2 main parties. It can overrule an upper house (formerly limited to aristocrats) veto with a 2/3 majority. The government in conjunction with the monarch appoints the judiciary; Unlike British court practice, Japan's monarch-obedient judges can **openly** overrule statutory laws if they conflict with the constitution (and thus the monarch) in a dispute.

* The **Swedish** parliamentary hereditary monarchy developed from an elective monarchy. The "Instrument of Government" (part of the Basic Laws of Sweden) apparently restricts the power of the monarch in a complex way, but ultimately cannot remove it. Sweden's "revolutions" were bloodless democracy-increasing modifications of the monarchy.

* **New Zealand** (under the British monarch) installed a mixed-member-proportional system via a simple-majority referendum (This enabled in 1996, 1999, 2008, 2011, 2014 and 2017 minor-party candidates with even less than 0.5% of the total vote to bypass the 5% minimum threshold via the "replaced" relative-majority First-Past-the-Post election method, distorting proportionality usually in favour of conservative governments).

* The Constitution of **Spain** enshrines parliamentary monarchy, after the referendum question for passing the apparently democratic constitution into law was created by 7 of the king's officials, incl. 4 followers of the previous dictator. Judges and other high officials ultimately act on behalf of the monarch.

* The Constitution of the **Netherlands** enshrines a parliamentary monarchy, where the king is active part of the government and appoints an "(in)formateur" who facilitates coalition (compromise-multi-party-government) building.

Parliamentary Theocracies

The **Iranian** revolution replaced a monarchy with a theocracy (rule by unelected religious priests); **Egypt's** revolutions replaced a monarchy with the declared aim to create a republic, but instead under military control constitutionally installing a theocracy/presidential-dictatorship blend, later softened to Islamic state religion with a very detailed constitution including human rights, but vague on election methods for parliament etc., the president even being able to appoint 5% of parliamentarians.

One-Party Oligarchies

* The **Russian** monarch (tsar) was replaced through the Russian revolution, firstly by rich interests/aristocrats, then violently by the military, which maintained its dominance for decades. It imposed a narrow one-party-system interpretation of Marxist communism with democracy pretence, where only one party could be "elected" while other parties were actively suppressed.

Factories, farms etc. and even worker-unions' properties became constitutionally centralised property of the Soviet Union. The 1993 Russian constitution enshrined a powerful executive president, via a >50%-simple-majority 2-round election, who can dissolve the Duma parliament (then partially-proportionally but now proportionally elected). In 2020 the president created a constitution-changing referendum giving parliament more powers. This new-start constitution enabled him to continue 2 more terms that were unconstitutional, so that in practice the established one-party oligarchy and presidential rule continued. This led to the Russian war invasion of Ukraine in 2022.

* (Multi-party democracies, although apparently constitutionally enabled, are prevented by imprisoning opposition candidates under e.g. national-security-law pretences, and by intimidating and conditioning the public against democratic tendencies with fear of repercussions through total surveillance; Obvious examples are China enacting the so-called "Social Credit" **A**rtificial-**I**ntelligence total-surveillance demerit-point system that imposes removal of freedoms as punishment for contravening official behavioral dictates, incl. for political opposition and democratic tendencies — AI is progressively embedded in western systems, while the undemocratic UN's WHO, together with the EU Commission (not the EU parliament), is promoting a similar permanent system under the guise of digital-vaccination-pass ID for Covid-pandemics control/prevention with resulting mandatory-compulsory vaccinations — and the Hong Kong breach of the Britain-China treaty in 2020 when China enforced its national security law there, thus showing that a similar takeover is prepared by cunningly intimidating the world to treat the independent nation Taiwan as Chinese territory.)

* A stark example of such democracy/republic pretence was **East Germany**, calling itself "German Democratic Republic"; Post-war occupier Russia created and remote-controlled its one-party oligarchy dictatorship, and increased the Nazi's oppressive total surveillance using the state security police called Stasi; people did not turn their TV aerials to western senders for fear of repercussions. The Ukraine-war-initiating Russian president was a KGB-within-Stasi operator 1985-1990; The KGB in Russia fulfills German-Wikipedia's definition of fascism.

* Another example is **China** which installed a similar system calling itself people's republic: China's Constitution derived from the Soviet Union's constitution, with many modifications, except the absolute rule of the Communist Party without checks & balances (i.e. separation of powers), and called "people's democratic dictatorship", but traditionally power is concentrated in the paramount leader. This even led to a famine, and decades later to extreme pollution through unregulated industrial growth. The party-candidate selection method appears undetermined, so that in practice an established minority oligarchy maintains power and violently suppresses any democracy demands that were (among other human rights) previously on-the-face-of-it constitutionally allowed. In 2018 the president achieved constitutional change from limiting the presidential tenure to 2 periods into unlimited presidency, thus enabling his life-long dictatorship. ⇧

Constitutional Democracies

* After the first world war **Germany** had created an unguarded bad-working (with up to 17 parties and democracy-hostile officials incl. judges and even the president from the kaiser/monarchy era) parliamentary democracy called the Weimar-Republik; It was overpowered and removed by Hitler using force incl. the torching of the Reichstag parliament, installing a (Nazi/Nationalsozialist) one-party/one-leader dictatorship. The German post-war democracy under the occupation by the allied victors used their systems as example, but improved them with the help of the Nazi experience, like human rights and proportional parliamentary representation with an upper house, president and a written constitutional Basic Law as safeguard.

* Germany's neighbour **Austria** created a proportional parliamentary democracy, in which the safeguarding president is directly elected via >50% simple majority, while Switzerland strongly included referenda in her constitution.

* The **Swiss** constitution emphasises direct-democracy referenda as ultimate test. It lists considerably more rights than the standard human rights: Freedom of expression that includes reception of such expressions while censorship is prohibited; Postal, telecom and data privacy; Gene manipulation of germ cells (incl. via vaccines) is forbidden; Access to basic food; Children's education; And even detailed environmental protection explicitly including sustainability; But also military-/disaster-response-training conscription. The core content of these rights is untouchable — Bundesrat (upper-house) representatives and federal-court judges are elected by the proportional parliament, but this court cannot determine their actions and thus constitutionality of laws, only indirectly through their application. Constitutional changes must be determined by referendum, without requiring a safeguarding supermajority. Parliamentary committees must have at least 50% attending members.

* The **Jewish** survivors of the Nazi Holocaust created constitution-like Basic Laws of **Israel,** determining proportional representation with a minimum 3.25%-threshold, with a safeguarding president elected by the Knesset parliament, but do not contain democracy safeguards (e.g. supermajority for constitutional changes, party-wide democratic determination of general-election candidates): In 2023 the conservative government tried to remove judicial constitution safeguards (i.e. invalidation of unconstitutional laws, constitutional/reasonable interpretations of laws, government-independent appointment of judges). **[**Palestinian aspects not examined**]**

* The **French** Revolution violently removed the monarchy, and developed democracy into today's 5_{th}constitutional republic. Non-proportional only slightly improved relative-majority elections with 2-rounds determine the legislative and the powerful president, who has dictatorship-like powers in a state emergency, even though the National Assembly can then not be dissolved. He is heading the powerful government-minister cabinet, but the proportional National Assembly has the ultimate legislative power, although the Senate and the president can temporarily (but for constitutional alterations persistently) veto law designs (but in 2022 he overruled parliament by increasing the retirement age). Initiations of referenda need at least the agreement of the president and the government. The judicative has investigative powers.

* The **Italian** post-war constitution established a partly proportional 2-chamber parliament mixed with very complicated regional election requirements, which often resulted in relatively short- ⇧

lived multiple-party governments. In 2017 the constitution court judged in favour of paramount proportional elections, although complicated minimum threshold requirements remained. Detailed [human] rights as well as social duties were enshrined (incl. even the duty to work, which would as labour enforcement invalidate all other rights and is therefore in practice irrelevant), as well as free enterprise on condition it does not damage the common good, health & safety, liberty and human dignity; secret [fascistic] associations were forbidden, obviously a result of Mafia and Mussolini fascism. It also established the separation of state and church (The Catholic Vatican is almost literally a privileged separate state).The president has democracy-safeguarding powers that provide some government-independence of the judiciary (state prosecutors are part of the judicial branch and thus independent from the government). The constitution requires special supermajorities for constitutional alterations, but even explicitly disables a change of its republic character.

* The **Greek** constitution similarly prevents constitution alterations of the democracy character and its human-rights safeguards, and contains many detailed rights. But in 2023 the conservative government's 2020 law changed the new 1-month-old proportional system (with a 3% threshold) back to a major-party bonus/reinforcement (up to 50 extra seats) after a snap election, avoiding the constitution's 60%-supermajority requirement. It effectively resulted in relative-majority (but often minority) rule similar to the British system. The Hellenic parliament can only change the constitution by achieving a 60%-supermajority in 2-periods' votes at least once. The 1975 alteration replaced the constitutional parliamentary monarchy with a [constitutional presidential parliamentary] democracy (the Greek word has both meanings). The Orthodox Church is enshrined as the major self-ruling religion.

Open-Source Democracy Constitution

Purpose-limited horizontal direct democracies developed using open-source computer programs, where participants contribute and benefit equally as well as directly regulate each other for the common good/benefit. The computer program serves also as the constitution, and is subject to this regulation/improvement. The safeguards against take-over by fascistic interests consists of the non-profit voluntary contribution character, the light hierarchy (which is determined by achieving proficiency in the program use and the proof of honest participation through successful contributions in full unpredictable view of other proficient participants), the considerable amount of active participants, and a semi-judicial notice-board/Arbitrary Committee complaints provision. Wikipedia Encyclopaedia and Linux computer operating systems are 2 major examples.

However, a lack of reliable safeguarded constitutions could enable a hidden take-over by egocentric/fascistic/non-democratic-government interests that could pay "voluntary non-profit" users/officials for using/manipulating/policing the program to maximise their own power and eliminate criticism/correction.

Wikipedia Code.docx incl. inbuilt **references** and **WP message exchange** can be downloaded from **:** docs.google.com/document/d/1ekUJ_oXz4J4ZheV0fAx6_3vguWW0FMpKGty7xAFSLKw/edit?usp=sharing *Simply paste it into the edit field of **any** wikipedia article and click "**Preview**" at bottom.*

Universal Democracy Constitution.pdf (full Wikipedia text, but without references) **:** drive.google.com/file/d/1ebshn4iijKR52BMobQOE_0bVtD3DXIhP/view?usp=drive_link ⇧

The Repeating-History Loops of Dictatorship Instability

-- a Rough Guide to Recognising Dictatorship-Loop Variations to Big-Brother's 1984 --

Like with every other human, a new dictator starts at the level of family or esp. its substitutes. The experiences of a lack of true love together with power play, violent dominance, ruthless competition and physical punishment/fight become the learnt limited basis for problem solving that is then applied throughout later life, even though it may be refined with ideological/religious justifications and covered-up to prevent competitors/challengers and subordinates copying it with success:

- Extended family/tribe/religious group/business/brotherhood/gang/paramilitary group etc.

This learnt ladder of hierarchical command-versus-obey is climbed up using politics, reputation damage, bullying, fights and less often broader intelligent thinking to reach the next command level:

- Family leader/tribe chief/sheikh/priest/business owner/grand master/gang leader/captain;

Due to this success, such leaders suffer from the delusion that they are different, infallible or even entirely genetically superior to the human race and life they come from, which results in their expanding ego-centric world view. They claim to be the strong leader with the obvious simple dualistic (black-versus-white, good-vs-evil, strong-vs-weak, right-vs-wrong, command-vs-obey) solutions that the country needed, and which hindering critics were genetically too dumb to see. Thorough analytic assessment of naturally complex multi-variable realities/interdependencies is ridiculed/discouraged without opposition under increasing control of mass media, as it cannot be reduced to primitive propaganda sound bites. Power levels on a country's national scale are aimed for:

- Prime Minister/vice president/business-corporation owner/cardinal/general etc.

Everyone who fails to show love for the dictator or to recognise this genetic superiority must be subjugated by force, and if practicable be ruthlessly arrested, imprisoned, tortured, killed or even cannibalised; The injustice against potential dissidents is accumulating and increasing, now being enshrined in laws. Creation of fear is an integral tool to fortify the power against competitors.

Factual competence/critical thinking becomes an undesired attribute, and lower leading positions are filled with prostituting followers. At this stage logical shortcomings of the dictator's abilities and "wisdom" become increasingly apparent, but are officially whitewashed and excused to the undereducated parts of the population; Its subgroups' philosophies are mainstreamed/manipulated in an organised way using subtle misinformation or even open repetitive emotional propaganda sound bites – This is readily taken in, because the effortless complacent belonging to a superior-by-birth leader/nation/class feels extremely good, while the own enslaved inferiority to oligarchs is overlooked under this increasing nationalistic/patriotic peer pressure…

Divide-and-rule injustice/hatred between subgroups is deliberately created/upheld until these fight each other rather than the true dictatorship cause. Any resulting violent unrest is then called terrorism and quashed by extreme force. This also serves to justify total removal of the public's privacy, in order to nip potential dissidents in the bud far before they can achieve publicity as their only tool for a revolution – Information equals power for the "all-seeing Big-Brother eye", and computer data with search algorithms offer themselves to such abuse, as they cannot be sufficiently safeguarded against secret access that selected programmers have integrated during original program/computer design.

Dictators are well aware of their dependence on a fascistic brotherhood/gang structure, and make their higher-ranking commanders believe to be indispensable partners with an active equal share in the reign and spoils, which appears as rule by a few rich called oligarchy. Only the most intelligent dictators/oligarchs can resist the urge to openly show their egocentric totalitarian power structure, ⇧

and hide it to prevent becoming predictable targets -- But most of them pretend a democracy/republic, too big for dissidents to fight against the apparent will of an entire nation's population… However, an oligarchy is only temporary, as it is incompatible with dictators'/oligarchs' egocentric philosophy:

- Oligarchy/polit-bureau rule/business-roundtable economy/corporate-business monopoly etc.

At this stage the dictator would aim to permanently change the society structure/constitution towards concentration of power in one person, called totalitarianism, because checks & balances including democratic elections endanger the achieved power. Some simple dictators may use a violent military coup, while the more intelligent use the lack of constitutional democracy safeguards that have been deliberately prevented/disabled, and deceive the population into voting against democracy and the separation of governmental, judicial and presidential powers, permanently justifying dictatorship. Some use the method of advancing against democracy, justice and human rights until the population notices it, then soothing the population by retreating 1 step. After a pause to support complacent forgetfulness this method is repeated, apparently irreversibly advancing dictatorship by stealth. On the next level this terrorism method is applied onto other countries. The dictator is now called:

- President/emir/paramount religious priest/chief commander etc.

The superiority/egocentricity delusion leads to stark expansion/imperialism, as the world has to be convinced by force; Parallel societies are increasingly affected by war-provoking threats, to provide justification for a pre-emptive "defence"-war as a diversion, with the side effect of prior military growth/"full"employment, but also silently as a useless-consumer/inferior-population reduction tool.

By now the dictator would have taken up the philosophy of e.g. Gnosticism, where humans are considered as gods, and would believe to be the ultimate deity/god by birth; Fortification of hereditary dictatorship/monarchy by birth is the remaining level, while higher-ranking oligarchs/commanders get some breadcrumbs by becoming hereditary aristocrats; The dictator is now

- King/queen/emperor etc.

At least by now the egocentric/-maniac dictator and the assisting fascistic oligarch elite have lost all ability of self-criticism and self-restriction, but become increasingly "paranoid" – Knowing their own ruthless dictatorship methods, they fear competing assassinators and retribution even from their own high-ranking commanders, and become increasingly isolated. They use pre-emptive maximum force against their own supporters, once they believe to see signs of dissent. But they cannot control all the multitude possibilities of subversions, esp. by computer/robotics programmers. They enter a vicious self-fulfilling circle that will end in assassination/replacement by competitors, and ultimately in a violent revolution that would try to return to a more equal and just society of previous levels. But having been conditioned by the repeating-history loops of dictatorship, revolutionaries usually know only command-versus-obey force, and install a similar system at one of the previous levels. But there naturally exists no simple enduring win-versus-lose/command-vs-obey single-person solution:

- Literal democracy is an utopia, because practical democracy is always a method of optimising compromises, combining the many partially conflicting interests within an equal-rights rule by a population, whereas simple either-win-or-lose solutions are unrealistic dreams of command-versus-obey ignoramuses who refuse to see that only god-like ruthless unrestrained monarchs can ultimately win, setting an example for the population before losing everything;

  With corresponding further accumulating damage to "their" (everyone's) planet's biosphere…

For detailed constitutional protection of democracy see also the Universal Democracy Constitution.